

## LIPSITZ & MCALLISTER, LLC

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ATTORNEYS

BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 8 755 MAIN STREET Monroe, Connecticut 06468

BARRY R. LIPSITZ DOUGLAS M. MCALLISTER TELEPHONE: (203) 459-0200 FACSIMILE: (203) 459-0201

MAIL STOP AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** 

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

September 29, 2008

Examiner: A. Lang

Art Unit: 3731

In re Application of: T. Kleinwaechter

Application No.:

10/615,311

Filed:

July 7, 2003

Title:

SURGICAL SAW BLADE

Dear Sir:

Transmitted herewith is:

Response to Interview Summary dated September 29, 2008 -- 2 pages. 

[X] Return receipt postage prepaid postcard.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas M. McAllister

Reg. No. 37,886

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Lipsitz & McAllister, LLC 755 Main Street, Bldg. No. 8

Monroe, CT 06468

(203) 459-0200

Attorney Docket No.: HOE-764



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	)	
· ;	)	
T. Kleinwaechter	. ) I	Examiner: A. Lang
	)	
Serial No.: 10/615,311	) 1	Art Unit: 3731
•	)	
Filed: July 7, 2003	)	
	)	

For: SURGICAL SAW BLADE

MAIL STOP AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 2313-1450 on: September 29, 2008.

ignature: Caral Prentice

## RESPONSE TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Dear Sir:

This Response is responsive to the Office Communication containing an Interview Summary mailed on September 25, 2008, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged.

Applicants agree with the content of the Interview Summary insofar as the Interview Summary indicates that the Examiner agreed that the Miller reference cited in the final Office Action does not overlap the pending claims. However, it is noted that the Examiner also agreed to withdraw the objection to claim 11 set forth on page 2 of the Office Action and the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-20, and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. The Examiner also agreed to withdraw the prior art rejections based on Miller. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the Office Action and issue a further office communication.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner officially withdraw the final Office Action dated May 28, 2008.